

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

It is respectfully requested that the corrected formal drawings on replacement sheets be approved and made a part of the record of the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 16 are independent claims.

Restriction Requirement

The undersigned acknowledges the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action. Claim 8 drawn to the distinct invention has been canceled. The amended and new claims presented are drawn to the elected invention.

Drawings

On page 3 of the Office Action the drawings were objected to. Accompanying this Reply are two replacement sheets with the reference character "1" in Figure 1 and the crosshatching of element 21 shown as a glass element.

The Examiner is requested to approve the drawing changes.

Foreign Priority

The notation that the foreign priority documents have been received is noted.

Objection to the Specification

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Abstract and the Title were objected to. A new Abstract and Title have been provided.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the Abstract and the Title.

Claim Objections

On page 4 of the Office Action claims 1 and 2 were objected to. These claims have been amended to alleviate the Examiner's concerns regarding the wording.

For the reasons set forth above the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 1 and 2.

Reply to Rejections

First Rejection

Claims 2, 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph for the reasons set forth in the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action.

The claims have been amended and now do comply with 35 USC 112. The Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112.

Second Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Okamoto et al. This rejection is traversed.

Initially in reading Okamoto the Office Action asserts that element 1 is the outer panel and that element 2 is the inner panel. Actually, element 2 which is made up of parts 2A 2B and 2C and is described in the reference as an interior side trim section 2 (see column 3, line 34 of the reference). The inner panel in the reference is element B (see column 3, line 31 of the reference). While the Office Action asserts that the base

plate is element B it is not as it is described as the inner panel in the reference. Also, reinforcing member 13 is not attached to the base plate as claimed in claim 3 and as shown in the specification and drawings.

With respect to the dependent claims depending on claim 1 these claims are considered patentable at least for the same reasons as the base claim.

As each and every limitation of the claims is not shown specifically or inherently in the reference, a rejection under 35 USC 102 is not viable.

Even though the claims have been amended, they are also not obvious without benefit of the Applicant's disclosure in restructuring the reference to arrive at the claims.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102.

Third Rejection

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakaguchi et al. This rejection is traversed.

While the reference shows an inner panel 20, 21 and 22 and an outer panel 12 (see column 3, lines 25-34), element 12 is not a base plate as asserted. Element 12 is a door module and not a base plate (see the paragraph bridging pages 3-4 of the reference). In the reference, element 55 is a base plate. See

column 4, lines 4 and 5 of the reference. But this base plate does not cover the central opening of the inner panel in the context claimed.

As each and every limitation of the claims is not shown or suggested by the reference, a rejection of claims 1 and its dependent claim 5 are not viable.

Although the claims have been amended, they are not suggested by the reference applied without benefit of the Applicant's own disclosure as a template in restructuring the reference.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102.

New Claims

New claims 9-16 have been added.

New claim 9 is dependent on claim 1 and provides that the base plate is located between the inner panel and the outer panel. This is not shown or suggested by the art applied.

Claims 10-15 are similar to claims 2-7 but depend on new claim 9. These claims show structure not shown or suggested by the art applied.

New independent claim 16 provides that the inner panel has a U-shape and that the base plate is located between the outer

and inner panels. This is not shown or suggested by the references applied.

Additional Art Cited

Additional art was cited by not applied. Accordingly, no comments are considered necessary.


Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Elliott Goldberg (Reg. No. 33,347) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Charles Gorenstein, #29,271  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

CG/EAG/jm  
649-931P

(Rev. 02/12/2004)